

**Before a Board of Inquiry  
Northern Corridor Improvements Project**

---

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act')

In the matter of a Board of Inquiry appointed under section 149J of the Act to consider notices of requirement for designations and resource consent applications by the New Zealand Transport Agency for the Northern Corridor Improvements Project

---

**Summary statement of Jeffrey George Bluett for the New Zealand Transport Agency (Air quality)**

Dated 20 July 2017

---

---

**KENSINGTON SWAN**

18 Viaduct Harbour Avenue Ph +64 9 379 4196  
Private Bag 92101 Fax +64 9 309 4276  
Auckland 1142 DX CP22001

Solicitor: C M Sheard/N McIndoe  
christina.sheard@kensingtonswan.com/nicky.mcindoe@kensingtonswan.com/

## **SUMMARY STATEMENT OF JEFFREY GEORGE BLUETT FOR THE NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY**

### **1 Introduction**

1.1 This summary statement provides a summary of my Evidence in Chief ('**EIC**') dated 20 April and includes an update to my evidence as a result of conferencing.

### **2 Summary of evidence in chief<sup>1</sup>**

2.1 The construction phase of the Project has a moderate to high potential for dust impacts to occur and these impacts are likely to be considered objectionable and/or offensive if not mitigated. Therefore, I consider it crucial to identify the key sources of dust and to:

- a Have mitigation practices in place to minimise the amount of dust emitted;
- b Have a monitoring programme in place to measure the effectiveness of the mitigation and facilitate a rapid response procedure if and when additional dust mitigation is required; and
- c Develop a Dust Management Plan ('**DMP**') which will set out a framework and processes for the effective implementation of the dust mitigation measures and monitoring programme.

2.2 If the DMP details the relevant information, describes the required dust mitigation actions, and is effectively implemented and monitored to ensure its effectiveness, then it is my expectation that the effects of the dust discharged during the construction phase of the Project will be minor or less than minor.

2.3 The assessment of air quality effects of the operational phase of the Project was undertaken using a dispersion model, which calculates ground level concentrations ('**GLCs**') of the key pollutants that are discharged from the vehicles using the roads.

---

<sup>1</sup> EIC, section 5.

- 2.4 From the assessment of operational effects of the Project on air quality I conclude that exceedances of the relevant air quality standards are unlikely to occur, so there is no need for a programme to mitigate these effects.
- 2.5 If the Project achieves the aim of increasing network capacity, traffic will flow more freely through the region, the total emissions will decline, and on an airshed scale this is likely to result in a slight net benefit for regional air quality as compared to the air quality if the Project were not built.

### **3 Update to evidence as a result of conferencing**

- 3.1 During the Planning expert conferencing session on 4 July 2017, I was contacted by the planning experts in regard to the resource consent conditions on dust management. The planning experts proposed to redraft conditions DMP.1 – DMP.4 in order to:
- a Better highlight the qualitative and quantitative dust mitigation trigger levels.
  - b More clearly define the content of the DMP.
  - c Make reporting of dust consistent with other consent reporting requirements.
  - d Make the conditions easier to follow.
- 3.2 The changes made to the conditions include:
- a Condition 1 now defines that the dust arising from the construction activities shall not cause offensive and objectionable effects as assessed by the FIDOL factors (Frequency, Intensity, Duration, Offensiveness and Location).
  - b Condition 2 requires that the monitored concentrations of Total Suspended Particulate (TSP) be below 250  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  (1-hour average) and 80  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  (24-hour average).
  - c Condition 3 now requires the DMP to:

- i Identify the sources of construction dust.
  - ii Identify sensitive receptors.
  - iii Define complaint procedures.
  - iv Define the methods of dust monitoring.
  - v Define the methods of dust mitigation.
- d Remove dust specific reporting requirements defined in the original DMP.4.
- 3.3 The Joint Witness Statement: Planning ('**JWS**') records that the changes to these conditions were discussed with me and but remained to be confirmed by me at the time of finalising the JWS.<sup>2</sup>
- 3.4 I have now reviewed the amendments to conditions DMP.1 – DMP.4 as contained in Annexure 3 to the JWS and I agree with the amendments with the exception of part of DMP.1.
- 3.5 The good practice guide referenced in DMP.1 is incorrect. To correct this, DMP1 should amended as follows (strike through notes deleted text, underline notes new text):
- a “Dust arising from the construction phase of the NCI Project shall not cause an offensive or objectionable effect at any point beyond the designation boundary, as assessed using the FIDOL factors (as defined in the Good Practice Guide for ~~Air Quality Monitoring and Data Management~~, Assessing and Managing Dust, Ministry for Environment, ~~2009~~2016<sup>3</sup>)”.

<sup>2</sup> JWS: Planning, 30 June / 3-6 July 2017, paragraph 7.3.6(a).

<sup>3</sup> Good Practice Guide for Assessing and Managing Dust. Ministry for the Environment Publication number ME1277. MfE 2016. <https://www.mfe.govt.nz/sites/default/files/media/Air/good-practice-guide-dust.pdf>

3.6 My evidence has not changed due to the changes to these conditions.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "J G Bluett". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J" and "G".

---

**Jeffrey George Bluett**

**20 July 2017**